

## REMARKS

Claims 1-63 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1-15, 32, 53-58, and 61-62 have been withdrawn as a result of a restriction requirement. Applicants appreciate the indication that Claim 63 has been deemed allowable. Claims 16-18, 23, 25, 37-38, 40, 43-52, and 59-60 have been amended; Claims 22, 24, 39, 41, and 42 have been cancelled; and Claims 64-68 have been added, leaving Claims 16-21, 23, 25-31, 33- 38, 40, 43-52, 59-60, and 64-68 for consideration.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 16-31, 33-52, and 59-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action claims that the inclusion of the limitation that the splats have an average diameter of greater than about 0.1 micrometer (micron) is new matter. The claims have been amended to remove this limitation, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)/103(a) Rejections

Claims 16-23, 26-31, 33-40, and 43-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over, an article by Padture et al. entitled "Towards Durable Thermal Barrier Coatings with Novel Microstructures Deposited by Solution Precursor Plasma Spray" (Acta Mater. 49 (2001) 2251-2257) (hereinafter "Padture"). In addition, Claims 59-60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Padture as applied to claims 16-23, 26-31, 33-40, and 43-52 above, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0031658 to Chow et al. (hereinafter "Chow").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner stated in the Final Office Action dated April 18, 2007 that the previously presented dependent Claims 24-25 and 41-42 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Independent Claims 16, 37, and 59 have been amended to include the limitations of these previously presented claims. Applicants submit that Padture and Chow fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended independent Claims 16, 37, and 59. Accordingly, these claims and the claims that depend therefrom are patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)/103(a) rejections applied to Claims 16-21, 23, 26-31, 33-38, 40, 43-52, and 59-60.

UCT-0040

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By Michelle L. Henderson  
Michelle L. Henderson  
Registration No. 42,654

Date: August 7, 2007  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (404) 607-9991  
Facsimile (404) 607-9981  
Customer No.: 23413